E 312
.63
.S865

WASHINGTON AND OUR FORE-FATHERS MADE DEMOCRACY SAFE FOR THE WORLD, NOT THE WORLD SAFE FOR DEMOCRACY

AN ADDRESS BY

EDWARD CASPER STOKES

BEFORE

THE WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF NEW JERSEY

With Greeting by ALFRED ELMER MILLS, President
and Proceedings in the Celebration

AT WASHINGTON'S HEADQUARTERS

IN MORRISTOWN, N. J.

ON FEBRUARY 22, 1919

E 312
.63
.S865
Washington

ADDRESSES

Before the Members of the

WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF NEW JERSEY

At Headquarters, Morristown, New Jersey.

February 22, 1919.

President Alfred Elmer Mills called the assembly to order.

All present stood at attention while the orchestra played "The Star Spangled Banner."

The national anthem, "America," was then sung by all.

President Mills said:

Gentlemen of the Washington Association. The joys and sorrows of another year have passed. Once more we meet on this historic spot and once more I give you a most cordial welcome.

You see but little change in your surroundings. Through the gifts of generous friends valuable additions have been made to our collection of paintings and relics, but the old home remains the same. If Washington could return after nearly one hundred and forty years he would at once recognize his old headquarters. It is we who change. Our lives, our friends, our country, all have changed during the past eventful year. Death has wrung the hearts of all of us. It has removed our beloved Treasurer, Mr. John H. Bonsall, who for many years gave his devoted services to our Association. It has taken many

of our most valued members. It has laid low tens of thousands of our best and bravest on the battlefields of France.

Our boys have not died in vain, for to them we owe the victory that has crowned the allied arms. (Applause.)

On the 11th of November last, the little town of Senlis in Northern France witnessed the supreme triumph of the democratic nations of the world. The signing of the armistice by the representatives of Germany marked the overthrow of the Autocrat. Imperialism had succumbed to Democracy. A civilization based upon the greatest amount of individual freedom, had conquered one of socialistic formation ruled by a group of imperialistic leaders. The German with his curious combination of socialism and imperialism had fallen before gallant France, backed by Britain and America—the most individualistic of the nations—who, with their unlimited resources had sprung to her support. Right had prevailed. Washington's debt—our debt—to Lafayette had been repaid, and the waves of militarism and barbarism had been driven back.

The world is in suspense today lest the victories that our armies have won may prove of no avail through the Bolshevists and Anarchists who are trying to impose a despotism far worse than that of a Kaiser or a Czar.

Is personal initiative to be stifled? Is class consciousness to control? Is that mean and contemptible spirit of Caste that has cursed the peoples of the old world to replace the glorious freedom that has released the boundless energies of America?

These are questions that must be answered not by boys in khaki, but by you and me, by every thinking man. The responsibility is upon us.

One of the foremost thinkers on these great problems is with us today. He will speak to us on the subject, "Washington and Our Forefathers Made Democracy Safe for the World—Not the World Safe for Democracy."

I take great pleasure in calling on our old friend, Governor Stokes. (Applause.)

WASHINGTON AND OUR FORE-FATHERS MADE DEMOCRACY SAFE FOR THE WORLD, NOT THE WORLD SAFE FOR DEMOCRACY

An Address Delivered by Edward Caspar Stokes before the Washington Association of New Jersey on February 22, 1919.

MR. STOKES—Mr. President and Fellow Americans:

It is far from good form to begin an address with an apology. But in this case it at least has the merit of truth, and truth ought to be permissible on the anniversary of the cutting down of the cherry tree. (Laughter.) My apology is that this is my first visit to this historic spot so full of patriotic associations. Washington never said anything to me about it. My absence probably entirely escaped his notice, or it may be that he was entirely satisfied with the fact that for three years I had the honor of signing the appropriation to aid in the maintenance of this organization. At any rate, my visit here gives me a new phase of Washington's character. Added to his other illustrious characteristics, I now know that he was a connoisseur in the selection of the right place to live and he knew how to pick out a home. (Applause.) Although it is my first visit, I come with the greatest pleasure, and I should be guilty of lack of appreciation if I failed to acknowledge the compliment I feel in being able to be the guest of this honored Association and of this distinguished gathering.

Any anniversary occasion is always full of suggestions. It sharply contrasts the past with the present, and it marks

the deviations, if any there be, from the highways of our forefathers. The Father of His Country, in his farewell address, that manual of sound Americanism and sound patriotism, advised that this land of ours should hold aloof from foreign entanglements. That was his attitude.

How different the attitude of the present Chief Executive, who personally visits European fields, suggests policies to those nations, recommends forms of government, and advises an American partnership in a league of European and world problems and difficulties!

Was the Father of His Country altogether wrong in his policy of minding our own business? Is our present distinguished Chief Executive altogether right in the policy of mingling in the business of other nations?

To a judicial mind, and all minds should be judicial on an anniversary occasion, free from bias and prejudice, the great contrariety between the attitude of the Father of His Country and the distinguished chief who now guides the destinies of this Republic, ought to suggest careful consideration and deliberation on the proposed innvoations of the day.

For example, peace between the mother country and the colonies was signed in 1783. It was not until 1790 that Rhode Island ratified the Constitution. The thirteen colonies fought a common war. Their interests were largely identical, their conception of liberty and ideals the same, their racial characteristics so near alike as not to interfere with practical homogeneity, they were geographically contiguous, and their whole safety lay in the unity of action, and yet those thirteen colonies, so bound together in common interest, deliberated and debated and considered for seven years before they formed a safe league of nations.

Some of the questions in the boiling pot of Europe have been simmering for six thousand years, many of them for at least two thousand years. Never were there so many questions to be settled; never were suspicions so subtly keen; never were ambitions so whetted by opportunity; never were antagonisms so real, and yet some of our en-

thusiastic friends expect us to form a safe and sane league of nations for the whole world within a twelvemonth.

This hasty idealism of the day makes us wonder if some modern Phaethon is not wildly driving the chariot of the sun. At least, the patriotic student of history, with the caution of Webster in his opening remark in his reply to Hayne, wants to take his bearing before he steers into the open sea.

A nation is the sum total of its traditions and its experiences. They are our guides and our sign posts. The pioneers who blazed the way are held up to acclamation or derision, just in proportion as the pathway they laid out led to the comfort or misery of those who follow after.

Our present is not of our own making; it is the legacy of the past. We owe much to the past. Our religion, our Bible, our Ten Commandments, our Independence, and our Fourth of July, all come from the past. The lessons of the past are more pregnant than those of the present, because, as Patrick Henry said, "There is no way to judge the future but by the lamp of experience."

The success of this government is due to the wisdom of those who founded it, and not to the guess of those who would change it. The wisdom and judgment of those who founded it have been tried and proven. The guess of those who would change it is uncertain and problematical. Nay, it is uncertain? Are there no precedents even here?

The Constitution of the French Republic of 1848 contained practically every nostrum advocated by the radicals of today. And I have in my possession a political platform of one of the parties of that day, which in its plea for government ownership of railroads and canals and mines, and compensation to citizens for accidents, floods, fire, etc., whatever that may mean, and other measures, reads practically word for word like the propaganda of the radicals of this hour. And yet that republic so organized and so established fell to pieces of its own weight in four years, and ended in monarchy and the coup d'etat of Louis Napoleon in 1852.

The genesis of our land differed from all the nations. Most nations were conceived either in war or in hunger settled by tribes who were pushed on from behind by their foes, or by those who were seeking new and fertile fields for food. That is true of modern Italy, overrun by barbarians; true of Germany, settled by the Teuton; true of France, settled by the Celts; true of England, conquered first by the Angles, Saxons and Jutes and later by the Northmen. Not so America. Our land was settled not by unthinking adventurers, but by educated men. Robinson and Brewster, who led the Pilgrim fathers to Amsterdam, were university graduates; Roger Williams, the first to declare for religious freedom and for separation of church and state, was a son of English Cambridge. The dissolution of Parliament by Charles sent to Massachusetts, the Bay Colony, an influx of brains and scholarship whose character is indicated by the fact that nearly all the clergy of that day, including John Harvard, John Cotton, Thomas Shepherd and Thomas Hooker were college graduates.

So scholarly were our forefathers that they were leaders on both sides of the Atlantic. Some of them held high rank in the military service; some of them held high positions in the civil service of the Protectorate. Twelve of the first twenty graduates of Harvard went back to England to aid in the cause of liberty. And it is not too much to say, although it might seem a little like boasting, and we have a right to boast today, it is not too much to say that Payne and Cromwell and Sidney, Hampden and Milton, those disciples of English liberty, were the scholars of teachers on this side of the Atlantic. John Adams, Samuel Adams, James Otis, glorious names in American history, were sons of old Harvard.

This Republic of ours was founded by educated men, and men of character. Of the fifty-five members of the Constitutional Convention, thirty-three were college graduates, and the eight leaders of the great debates were all college men. And when that Convention adjourned, it was Hamilton, a son of Columbia, who induced New York to

join the union of states, and it was Madison, a son of our own Princeton, who in spite of the firm protest of Patrick Henry, placed Virginia by her side.

America, perhaps, at that time was the land of the brainest men of the world.

The dissolution of Parliament by Charles, to which I have referred, gave us that influx of scholarship. When the Protectorate was established, there came here the Cavalier, hating democracy and loving his king, but a man of courage, culture and daring. At the restoration, supposed to be peaceful, but a restoration of confiscation, we fell heir to another influx of fine culture, brains and brawn. The Revocation of the Edict of Nantes gave us another contribution, that fine strain of the Huguenot. Add to that the Quakers, with statesmen like Penn and the Knickerbockers of Manhattan that came from Holland, that land of liberty, and the common school, and it is no exaggeration to say, my friends, that at that time America was the home of the finest characters and the finest scholarship in the world. It was these men who made our democracy what it is. It was these men who made democracy safe, and with this fact in mind is it wise to forget in this hour all the lessons, all the advice, all the experience of ancestors so wise, in this period of reformation after civilization has been saved, a victory to which you, Mr. President, so eloquently referred.

In the work, I think they call it, of reconstruction, is it not well to remember, that innovation is not always reform, and that this country of ours has some principles and assets worthy of preservation without change? (Applause.)

The policies that have made our land a land of more freedom, of more happiness, of more privilege, of more opportunity for the lowly than any other land on earth, must have some good in them. Our constitution after a hundred years of trial was declared by Gladstone and Bryce to be the greatest instrument ever emanating from the brains of men. It sufficed for three millions of people

along the Atlantic seaboard. It suffices today for a hundred millions scattered over the continent's expanse—even—even further than that, for it reaches from sunrise to sunset. It has been equally good in peace or war. It enabled us to double our territory by the purchase of Louisiana, and to write the marvelous story of our growth, religious, educational, industrial and material. And it has stood the test of this progress and vicissitude for one hundred and thirty years with only four fundamental changes—only four fundamental changes necessary to be added to the wisdom of our fathers in a journey of one hundred and thirty years.

And yet today, or until recently, for one has now been adopted, there have been pending at one and the same time four proposed amendments, some of them mere police regulations that never ought to be written into the organic law of our country. Every patriot should hesitate before he allows the spirit of change to lay violent hands upon an instrument that has proven so useful and efficient.

Moreover, my friends, the demand for change does not come from the men who fought our battles. They want to return to the old conditions they left. They want to come back to the same mother and the same father and the same wife and the same children and the same old home they left behind, just as when you revisit your boyhood scenes you want to find them just as when you played among them.

Our heroes abroad want none of this Bolsheviki and socialistic failure they have witnessed on the soil of Europe. (Applause.) They are homesick not for new but for the old conditions, and we have no right in their absence, without any opportunity upon their part, either to vote or express opinion, to change this land of ours from one of individual freedom and initiative to a paternal and socialistic government of autocratic control of business enterprise. (Applause.)

The great factor in America's greatness, as you suggested, Mr. President, has been the individual and his

freedom, just as it was when Greece was great, or when Rome was mighty.

In our patriotic personification of government, we are often misled into thinking that government is an entity and a personalty, and we forget it was individuals who framed and made it. We are a queer set of reformers. Just as soon as we give up one vice we become addicted to another. (Laughter.)

Just now, you know, we have got the fashion of giving up drink, but we are taking to phrasing. (Laughter.) And we are lost in phrases. Nobody ever analyzes them, nobody ever thinks what they mean. That is too much work. "Making the world safe for democracy" is a beautiful phrase, but there isn't a man here who knows what it means. (Laughter.) and no man ever did. Making democracy safe for the world is the real problem. (Applause.)

Democracy is not safe for anything unless you make it so. Democracy is not a virtue. It is the result of a virtue. It is the outcome of brains and character. Democracy has not made Russia safe. If all reports are true, and they are well authenticated, in that land religion is overthrown, the family life destroyed, and all women from seventeen years of age upwards, either married or single, have become the common property of the state, a form of state ownership and state control that have made degenerates and animals out of men, a most horrible condition of infamy. Why, because the Bolsheviki have not made democracy safe. Democracy never made America safe. It was American brains and character that made free government and democracy in our land possible. (Applause.)

I referred to the character of our ancestors. By the common consent of historians, the members of the second Continental Congress were the finest body of minds ever gathered together in the history of the world in deliberative assembly. Take old Virginia as an illustration. George Washington, the Father of His Country; Richard Henry Lee, who moved that the colonies should be free and independent; Patrick Henry, whose "Liberty or Death" has

been mouthed by every school boy; Mason, the author of the bill of rights; Jefferson, the author of the Declaration Madison, the father of the Constitution; Marshall, the first Chief Justice, who breathed into it virility and vitality; Monroe, the author of the doctrine that no European monarchial flag should find permanent lodgment on the soil of the western hemisphere—all these lived at one and the same time in a single one of the thirteen colonies. (Applause.)

The age of an Augustus or Pericles produced no such galaxy of great names. Add to these the Hamiltons and Clintons of New York, the Adamses and the Otises of Massachusetts, the Wilsons and Franklins of Pennsylvania, the Rutledges and Gasdens of the Carolinas. It was these men and their contemporaries that made our government what it is. The government did not make these men. Government is the result, not the cause of individual achievement and effort.

Civilization if it is to survive must develop individuals. Religion and art and science, philosophy and trade and commerce and transportation and business, the children of civilization, are the result not of collective but of individual effort.

You may have looked upon some magnificent painting, like that of the Sistine Madonna. An individual painted that picture. The masses never painted a picture. You may have gazed enraptured upon some beautiful statue. An individual like a Phidias carved that statue. The masses never carves a statue. You may have sat enthralled under some thrilling oration. An individual delivered that oration. The masses never made an oration. The masses never invented a machine or framed a statue, or penned a poem, or shaped a cathedral, or discovered a law of gravitation. It is individuals who take these steps of progress alone, and the whole story of social development in this world has been the struggle of the individual to break through the procrustean bed of governmental direction and control.

Greece was great so long as she was an individual, and

she failed when she became socialistic. Rome was mighty so long as she was composed of an aggregate of local activities, but the empire decayed when a centralized government became the business umpire of her people.

The free cities of the middle ages and the feudal system dwelt side by side, but it was the burghers of the free cities who were the pioneers in business, outstripping the stagnant life of their feudal neighbors, ruled over by some governmental overlord.

The Renaissance, known to every student of history, was nothing more nor less than the protest of the individual against governmental and ecclesiastical direction of life, and when the Renaissance came the world awoke, the dark ages ceased and progress began, and like stars out of the firmament of the night, there came a Guttenberg with his printing press, an Erasmus, with his new learning, a Columbus to chart the seas, a Galileo and Copernicus to unfold the heavens, a Raphael and Angelo to charm with art, a Newton to weigh the planets in their courses, and later a Shakespeare to dramatize the virtues and weaknesses of the age.

Within three hundred years from the outbreak of this individualism, the individuals to whom I have referred, sat in the city of Philadelphia and framed a government, deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed. (Applause.)

We have just finished a war between these two ideas, and that is all this war was, nothing more, nothing less; between the two ideas of the individual on one hand and government control on the other; between two ideas which Abraham Lincoln declared had always been in conflict since the dawn of history, the right of the individual to carve out his own destiny, and the effort of the government to control it.

I place Germany and America in illustrative contrast: Germany, government owned and government controlled, ninety-two per cent. of her railroads government owned, her telephones and telegraph lines likewise, her banks,

government agents, her business and industries either in government partnership or under the government thumb, producing the finest industrial organization the world ever saw, with the most scientific war machine ever known in history, but a paternal rule that made her people mere working machines, barbaric and soulless.

I turn now to America. Her telephones and telegraphs and roalroads and business enterprises not government owned, but individual in ownership and effort. If her policy did not produce as efficient workers as that of Germany, it did produce real men and women, fine characters, recognizing their obligations to their fellowmen. (Applause.)

And when the scientific war machine of that government owned and government controlled empire of Germany met the unfettered individualism of America on the field, the German machine went down in defeat, and individual America triumphed. (Applause.)

The one unanswerable argument of the world against government ownership and state socialism is the verdict of the European battlefields in favor of the American flag. (Applause.)

And yet, my friends, you know, there are some that honestly advise that we revise the policy of individual freedom that has made us great, and adopt the policy of Germany which we have denounced as barbaric and uncivilized. They are honest in that, but they forgot. They forgot that it is brains and not things that make wealth.

You know we are very apt to follow in the pathway of the fellow who has gone before without thinking, and there is a lot of political economy accepted in this world in some of our schools that is not orthodox.

Now, there isn't any such thing as intrinsic wealth in any true political economy, or intrinsic value, if you want to call it. There isn't any intrinsic value in this building. There isn't any wealth or value in any of your buildings or industries, your houses and lands and lots in Morristown. The wealth lies in the brains of your citizens and these other things are only their tools and instruments, and if

all of your citizens should leave Morristown today and none should ever return to take their place, Morristown as a deserted community would be absolutely valueless, unworthy even of the attention of the tax collector.

Why? Because its wealth would depart with the brains of its citizens. Why, this land of ours with its mines of copper and gold and silver, wonderful forests, water falls and fertile fields, was here for centuries, but they remained a wilderness and waste in the hands of the Indians. But when God sent over that little cargo of brains in the Mayflower, they turned the wilderness into a garden and the waste into sources of wealth. It was the brains of the human cargo of the Mayflower, the Susane Constant and the Half-Moon and their descendants that made our prosperity and progress. That is a kind of thing that makes our democracy safe.

Jefferson purchased the whole of Louisiana, stretching from the Mississippi nearly to the Pacific for less than two cents an acre. The victorious Union soldiers went out there and settled it under the homestead act, and today this waste that Jefferson purchased turns out annually over ten billions of dollars in the form of harvests; it feeds one-third of the people of the world, and it furnished the food and sustenance that enabled the allies to win the war.

It was not government ownership of the land that did that. It was brains and character and intelligence of the farmer settlers that turned that desert of Jefferson into the granery of the world. It was not artificial fertilizer and potash that fertilized those fields. It was the brains of the individuals who lived there that fertilized that desert and made it blossom like a rose.

That nation progresses most that permits the unfettered development of its brains, the real source of wealth; and that nation progresses least whose government usurps the activities of business and trade and commerce, and reduces its citizens to the dead level of bureaucratic employes.

I have been at the head of one of these bureaucratic departments and I know something about it, and my friend Salmon is going to take the place. After he has been there awhile he will make just the same kind of a speech on this subject that I am making. Now, if there is anything more pitiful or more withering to the intellect than a position in one of the bureaucratic departments, God save us. I don't want to seem to be cheap or to use cheap expressions, but I am only using it to be forceful when I say when I was there I used to fire the young men out of that office into the business world before their brains dried up. (Laughter and applause.)

This question of government control is mental and psychological as well as economic. You don't find a Morse, —I believe he used to work up here in Morristown, didn't he? You don't find a Morse or an Edison, or a Wright or a Holland, in a government laboratory. You never developed a sleeping car under governmental ownership of railroads. We had sleeping cars in this country thirty-five years before the Midland road of England announced through its managers with great gusto that they had formed a contract with an American individual by the name of Pullman and that thereafter they would be able to render that service to their people.

Just before he left for Europe, President Wilson appeared before Congress for a few words of advice. (Laughter.) He has that habit. (Laughter.) He drops in occasionally upon Congress for a cup of afternoon tea, and as a rule when he leaves Congress has the tea and he has Congress. (Laughter.) In the course of his remarks on this occasion he said, "The American people do not need to be coached or led. They know their own business." "They know their own business." Any leading strings that we might seek to put upon them would speedily become hopelessly entangled, because they would pay no attention to them and go their own way." The American business man is resourceful and has initiative. That splendid statesmanlike utterance of President Wilson, if it means anything, means

that government interference with business ought to forever cease. (Applause.) And as President Wilson spoke he was a splendid illustration himself of the individualism that he was then portraying. Can you think of Woodrow Wilson under government or even congressional control? (Laughter.) Has not his whole plea been to give him power and freedom from government red tape that he might be able more quickly to solve the problem of the war?

Now, if you can trust your President of the United States free from control and restraint to solve the problems of a great war, you can trust the businessmen of America just as honest as your President and just as capable in their line to solve their own problems and manage their own business. (Applause.)

Washington founded this government; Lincoln saved it, and Wilson is spreading the doctrines to the world, and his one continuous plea is that the people of Europe shall have freedom and immunity from the governmental control and restraint under which they have lived for centuries. (Applause.)

Are not the American people entitled to the same thing? (Applause.) Why fetter the American business man with a system which every step in the progress of the world has condemned as inefficient and wrong? One illustration will suffice. It is a splendid tribute to the efficiency, enterprise and capacity of American citizenship. It was individual enterprise that pioneered the great railway lines of our country. These railroad pioneers blazed a new way over the trackless plains and through the forests, and they added millions to the wealth of the country in the newly opened mines, the villages and cities and industries that sprung up along the way at their touch. They did this great work on an average capitalization of $60,000 per mile, as against $109,000 in Germany, $139,000 in France, $275,000 in Great Britain. They paid the highest wages ever paid in the world, and on the whole they charged the lowest traffic rates in the world and with a

capitalization of only one-third of the average capitalization of the three countries I have named. They carried over these lines a traffic density double that of the government owned roads of Europe. In the parallel between the government owned roads of Europe and the individual owned roads of America, almost in any aspect of the question, the individualism of America beats government ownership two to one.

The other night I heard a great speech by a Democrat. I always like to quote a Democrat. It warms the cockles of my heart to quote a Democrat, because I never quote him unless he is right. Whenever I quote a Democrat I realize just how the father of the prodical son felt when he fell on the neck of his boy and wept on his return. (Laughter.) This Democrat was Congressman Small of North Carolina, chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee. He is a real statesman. These are some of the things he said:

"The history of the world shows that the danger to a republic is the tendency toward centralization. The more power you delegate to the federal government the more you enervate the citizen, and the less opportunity and power you give him to control his government. The more responsibilities you impose upon him, the more patriotic you make him, and the more patriotic you make him the safer you make democracy." Continuing he said, "I am pleased to say that in the war period there were no Democrats or no Republicans; the great Republican party united with the Democratic party in enacting any legislation and making any sacrifice necessary for a glorious victory, but in doing those things necessary for the winning of the war we very greatly curtailed the rights of individuals and bestowed autocratic powers upon their official representatives. I have no hesitation in stating that I heartily approve that sentiment, that as soon as practicable those powers should be withdrawn and restored to the people." (Applause.) I am not saying this, Congressman Small, a Democrat, is saying it. (Laughter.)

He is not through yet. "When we restore their rights to the owners, we ought not to hesitate to enact such legislation as will make our great instrumentalities of transportation more valuable to commerce and the welfare of the country without in any wise doing injustice or injuring those who have invested their moneys in these enterprises." Having taken the railroads over he said, under the pretext of war for purposes of government ownership, we have no right in operating them to so scramble them that we cannot unscramble them without rendering injustice to their owners. (Applause.) "Having taken them over," he is still speaking, lend me your ears a moment, "having taken over the telephone and telegraph wires under the pretext of war, we have no right to use that as an excuse for taking them away from their rightful owners and handing them over to a centralized government." (Applause.)

Those statesmanlike utterances of Congressman Small at once dispose effectively of the irresponsible suggestion that these properties be handed back to their owners bankrupt. Such a suggestion so shocks the sense of common honesty that it need not be discussed before this body. No decent government could afford to perpetrate that travesty on financial morals.

The railroads of this country are its great highways of trade and commerce; they are international highways; they are a proper subject for government co-operation, that they may be justly dealt with and deal justly with all.

They are not owned by a few people. They are owned directly and indirectly by fifty millions of our citizens, and those fifty millions of people have a just right to have honest and fair return upon their investment.

The public, if there is a distinction between fifty millions American people and the public, and I don't think there is, the public has the right to have the railroads have remunerative rates that they may render prompt and efficient service. The whole country has a right to have the railroads have remunerative rates that additional capital may be attracted for development and that new places may

be opened for abiding places for future generations of Americans yet to come, and that is what will make a contented and safer democracy.

Now, government ownership, socialism, just as you suggested, Mr. President, is a menace to democracy. I am not sure that it does not mean the end of democracy. It is autocracy enthroned and under it the goods of a merchant or a business man who might be out of political accord with the administration that happened then to be in power could be delayed and hampered in shipment. The newspapers that criticized the administration then in power could be lost on the way to their readers, and in the hands of a fourth-rate politician that power could so enslave the people of this country that they would only dare obey like unto that which made the civilization of Germany a menace to the world.

We believe in the rule of the people. If people are competent to run their own government, they are certainly competent to run their own business affairs. The American citizen is honest. He is just as honest as his own public official, and he is more competent in his own business and it prospers better in his own hands.

But it is the same story in every aspect. Every step in the world's progress has been the struggle of the individual for the right of self development and initiative against government control. Sometimes it has been a struggle for the freedom of the press; sometimes it has been a struggle for freedom of speech and action; sometimes it has been a struggle to worship God according to the dictates of conscience; sometimes for the right to labor and engage in business pursuits. But it has always been, no matter what form it assumes, the same principle as Lincoln said, "The struggle of the individual for the right of his own initiative." In America it has reached its highest culmination and has made us the greatest republic on earth, and it has made us a great republic because it has developed individuals competent to make democracy safe. It gave us a Washington and a Jefferson; it gave us a Garfield and

a McKinley, it gave us a Roosevelt and a Wilson, (Applause), differing in opinions and convictions, but men each the free architect of his own destiny; Americans all, honored at home and abroad; all the product not of a populace government-owned, but of a government people owned, a government of a people and by a people of intelligence and character that shall not perish from the earth.

At the close of Governor Stokes' oration a motion was unanimously passed thanking him for his splendid address and directing that it be printed and circulated among the members of the Association.

The meeting was finished by singing "Auld Lang Syne."

W 34

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

WERT BOOKBINDING
JAN 1989
Grantville, PA